	Case 5:07-cv-06122-JW Docu	ment 4	Filed 12/07/2007	Page 1 of 6	
1 2	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 13506 steven.bauer@lw.com	7),			
3	Robert E. Sims (Bar No. 116680), bob.sims@lw.com David M. Friedman (Bar No. 209214), david.friedman@lw.com Heather L. Thompson (Bar No. 246321), heather.thompson@lw.com				
4					
5					
6	505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, California 94111-65 Telephone: +1.415.391.0600	538			
7	Facsimile: +1.415.395.8095				
8	Attorneys for Defendant Carl W. Jasper				
9	Carr w. Jasper				
10	UNITE	ED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT	,	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
13					
14	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,		CASE NO. CV 07-	-6122 (HRL)	
15	Plaintiff,		NOTICE OF ADM	IINISTRATIVE MOTION	
16	V.				
17	CARL W. Jasper,				
18	Defendant.				
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

	Case 5:07-cv-06122-JW	Document 4	Filed 12/07/2007	Page 2 of 6	
1					
2					
3	_	•		ember 7, 2007 he filed an	
4	administrative motion to determine whether this case should be related to <i>In re Maxim Integrated</i>				
5	Products Inc. Derivative Liti				
6	Judge Ware of this division.	A copy of the mo	otion is attached hereto	as Exhibit A.	
7	D . 1 D . 1 7 2007		D (CH 1)	1	
8	Dated: December 7, 2007		Respectfully submi		
9			LATHAM & WAT Steven M. Baue		
10 11			Robert E. Sims David F. Friedn		
12			Heather L. Tho	npson	
13			By <u>/s/</u> Heather L. Thor		
14			Attorneys for D Carl W. Jasper	efendant	
15			Carr W. Jasper		
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

	Case 5:07-cv-06122-JW	Document 4	Filed 12/07/2007	Page 3 of 6
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7		EVI	IIDIT A	
8		EAI	HIBIT A	
9				
10 11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

	Case 5:07-cv-06122-JW	Document 4	Filed 12/07/2007	Page 4 of 6		
1	LATHAM & WATKINS LLI Steven M. Bauer (Bar No.					
2	steven.bauer@lw.com Robert E. Sims (Bar No. 116680),					
3	bob.sims@lw.com David M. Friedman (Bar N	No. 209214),				
4	david.friedman@lw.com Heather L. Thompson (Bar					
5	heather.thompson@lw.con 505 Montgomery Street, Suite	e 2000				
6 7	San Francisco, California 94 Telephone: +415.391.0600 Facsimile: +415.395.8095	111-2562				
8	Attorneys for Defendant Carl W. Jasper					
9		INITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION					
11						
12	IN RE MAXIM INTEGRATI PRODUCTS, INC. DERIVA		CASE NO. C. 06-334	4 JW		
13	LITIGATION			MOTION TO DETERMINE		
14			WHETHER CASES S CASE NO. 06-3344 J	SHOULD BE RELATED TO W		
15 16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

$_{\parallel}$ Case 5:07-cv-06122-JW Document 4 Filed 12/07/2007 Page 5 of 6

1	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, Defendant Carl W. Jasper ("Mr. Jasper")
2	hereby moves the Court for consideration of whether the matter SEC v. Carl W. Jasper, Case No.
3	07-CV-6122-HRL (filed December 4, 2007) ("SEC v. Jasper") is related, as defined by Civil
4	Local Rule 3-12, to this action (In re Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. Derivative Litigation- "In
5	re Maxim").
6	Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) states that cases are related when:
7	(1) The cases concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and
8	(2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor or expense or conflicting results if the cases
10	are conducted before different Judges.
11	Both factors are met here. Both cases spring from challenges to Maxim Integrated
12	Products, Inc.'s stock option practices, in other words, both cases "concern substantially the
13	same [] transaction or event." Civil L.R. 3-12(a)(1). Further, the SEC v. Jasper and In re
14	Maxim cases should be assigned to the same judge to promote judicial economy. If the cases
15	proceeded in front of separate judges, each judge would be required to educate himself or herself
16	as to the same set of transactions as well as similar legal arguments being made by both plaintiffs
17	and defendants. Furthermore, Mr. Jasper, as a defendant in both actions, will be required to
18	defend the same or substantially similar actions before two different judges. In short, allowing
19	these cases to proceed separately "will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and
20	expense" that may lead to conflicting results. Civil L. R. 3-12(a)(2).
21	Counsel for Mr. Jasper has notified all parties in this case as well as in Sec v.
22	Jasper of Mr. Jasper's intent to file this administrative motion. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-
23	12(f), Mr. Jasper respectfully requests that this Court grant its Motion and order the SEC v.
24	Jasper and In Re Maxim cases related.
25	
26	
27	
28	

	Case 5:07-cv-06122-JW	Document 4	Filed 12/07/2007	Page 6 of 6
1	Dated: December 7, 2007	Respectfully sul	bmitted,	DIG LL D
2		LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Steven M. Bauer		
3			Robert E. Sims David M. Friedm	an
4			Heather L. Thom	pson
5			By/s/_	
6			By/s/ Heather L. Thompson Attorneys for Defend Carl W. Jasper	n lant
7			Carl W. Jasper	
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				